THE LORD'S IDEA

CONCERNING THE

USE OF MONEY,

CONTRASTED WITH

THE DEVIL'S IDEA

CONCERNING THE

USE OF MONEY.

BY LEWIS W. CABELL, SR.,
OF BUCKINGHAM COUNTY, VA.

LYNCHBURG:
VIRGINIAN BOOK AND JOB PRINT.
1885.

WHAT CONSTITUTES HONEST MONEY.

Permit me, my readers, to call your attention to a subject of the greatest importance both to yourselves and to universal humanity. For it is a matter of Divine record that the Maker of the Universe, while acting as spiritual lawgiver to the Jewish nation, gave them also five plain civil laws which constituted the mode of applying the fundamental principles of all forms of civil government. These laws had reference to the use of money, to the adjustment of all disputes between man and man, to creditor and debtor, to the mode of punishing the thief, and to the principle of exacting pledges. And, since all civilized nations use money, have thieves to punish, have disputes to settle, have creditors and debtors, and allow the principle of exacting pledges, these laws are therefore evidently applicable to all civilized nations. It is also equally obvious that the Divine Lawgiver designed these laws for the use and benefit of other nations as much as for the Jewish nation, since He sustains the identical relation to all other nations as to the Jewish nation, being alike the Common Father of all nations—Jewish, Gentile and Christian, while they are alike his children and men, and are therefore identically affected by the operation of these laws. Hence, any civilized nation that adopted these divine civil laws would have an absolutely perfect mode of applying the fundamental principles of its civil government, because a divine law concerning civil things, is as perfect as a divine law concerning spiritual things. But it is a fact, and a most deplorable fact, that all civilized nations, especially the Christian nations, have without a single exception, adopted and placed upon their statute books five civil laws directly opposed to these five divine civil laws; and this act, without a parallel in the history of human infatuation and folly, these Christian nations perpetrated, while acknowledging, in common with the Jewish people, the author of these laws as their Maker—the great God of the Universe. Nor does this statement include the whole of this sad history. For our minds are so constituted that we must think either what is good and true, or think what is evil and false. But the good and true come from Heaven or God, while the evil and the false come from Hell or the Devil, and they are in direct opposition. Now, we have upon record what the Lord thinks is the proper mode of using money. He thinks it ought to be used without increase; also, it is recorded what He thinks is the proper mode of punishing the thief—thinks that the thief ought to receive nine and thirty stripes, and in addition thereto, ought to be made to pay to the individual from whom the property was taken double the amount thereof. In relation to the settlement of our disputes, He thinks they ought to be settled by men called judges, according to the testimony. In addition to this, He condescends to give us his opinion as to the character of these judges selected to settle our disputes. He thinks they ought to be just, intelligent, discreet, God-fearing men, and men hating covetousness. In relation to creditor and debtor, the Divine Lawgiver requires the creditor to release unconditionally his debtor at the lapse of seven years. But there is a peculiarity in this law to which I desire to call your attention. The Divine Lawgiver assigns a reason for this requirement. He requires the creditor to release his debtor unconditionally at the lapse of seven years *because*, as He states it, it is "*Jehovah's release*." Hence, as Jehovah is a being of infinite justice, as well as a being of infinite love and wisdom, he demands this release, as best for both creditor and debtor. The fifth civil law totally prohibits the requiring of security.

There is still another civil law which has been given to mankind by the Maker of all things, but not included in the five laws just mentioned, for the reason that this law has been accepted by some nations and placed upon their statute books. This law is expressed in these words: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed." To which was annexed a proviso or condition, to wit: that no one should suffer the death penalty unless his guilt was clearly established by the testimony of two witnesses. But the introduction of the lawyer and the jury of twelve on the trial of the murderer, connected with the privilege allowed to one of the twelve, the least minority, to nullify the verdict of eleven, the greatest majority, have rendered murder trials in this country a mere farce. In fact, it may be said of this entire system of settling disputes between man and man, that the shrewdest lawyer and the longest purse combined *as a rule*, get what is called justice.

Now, these five civil laws adopted by all civilized governments, being in direct opposition to the five divine civil laws, as stated above, have their origin in hell, since hell is in direct opposition to Heaven. It is therefore clearly demonstrated that the fundamental principles by which the civil governments of all Christian nations are administered, are derived directly from the Devil—man's unceasing and remorseless enemy. Again, this Divine Lawgiver knowing all things past, present, and future, perceiving the many and monstrous forms of evil that would, of necessity, arise from the violation of His law concerning the use of money and perceiving, also that the violation of this law would bring about a perversion of the other civil laws given by Him for the benefit of the whole human race, therefore the principle of *taking increase* of money alone received his reiterated and unqualified condemnation, using such significant language as this: "He that putteth forth his money on increase and *taketh increase* is an abomination in my sight." And the only reason assigned for this extraordinary conduct on the part of Christendom is this, that these civil laws were abolished by their Divine Author when he abolished the Jewish ceremonial law. But society could not exist without civil laws to protect person and property, and the use of money is as essential to the commercial and business life of a nation as the atmosphere is to the natural life. And this being known to the author of these civil laws, He did not abolish these civil laws; He simply allowed these Christian nations the liberty to accept or reject these civil laws, with one single exception. For it is a recorded fact in the Christian dispensation that this identical Divine Being, after having assumed humanity in the person of the Virgin Mary, went into the temple at Jerusalem, and finding therein money-changers, turned over their tables, drove them out with a scourge, made of small cords, and then said to these money-changers: "It is written that my house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves and robbers." It is true that the Divine record states that He found in the temple two other classes of men—"those that sold doves, and those that sold oxen; but to those that sold doves He said, take these things hence, make not my house a house of merchandise," and of course the men that sold oxen made his house a house of merchandise, like those that sold doves, and therefore received from this Wonderful Being this mild rebuke that the men that sold doves received.

Now, it is evident from this statement, that this Divine Being regarded exacting increase of money as taking something without rendering any equivalent, which, in English, is called stealing, since exacting increase of money was the only thing the money-changers did in the temple; and therefore, for this alone, they were denounced as thieves and robbers. But in the Old Scriptures this Divine Being denounces the exacting of increase as an abomination in his sight, and confirmed this by his opinion as expressed in the New Scriptures; then, unavoidably and logically, we arrive at this most startling conclusion: that the Divine Author of the Old and New Scriptures thinks that the taking increase of money is an abominable kind of stealing. Now, it is evident that the conclusion is arrived at by the assumption that the Divine Being called Jehovah in the Old Scriptures, and the Divine Being called Jesus in the New Scriptures, are absolutely identical. But, since it is well known that the entire portion of the Christian world, from the Nicene Council up to the present moment, comprising a period of fifteen hundred years, have failed to perceive and acknowledge this important fact, it is therefore a matter of necessity for me to show that the plain, explicit, oft-repeated, undeniable and undenied teachings of the Sacred Scriptures, both Old and New, do affirm and confirm this most astounding and most important of all facts.

Hence, this being accomplished, I will have *divine authority to offset* human authority: and then it can be clearly demonstrated that the exacting of increase of money is the most stupendous fraud and fiction that was ever conceived in the mind of the Devil. I also propose to be brief in my quotations on this subject. To those who are familiar with the teachings of the Old Scriptures it is known that their Divine Author calls himself, usually, by the name of Jehovah; and we find therein a great many utterances affirming, in the most positive manner, that He alone is God, Saviour and Redeemer. For instance, in the prophet Isaiah, we have the following declarations: "I, even I, am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Saviour, and all flesh shall know that I, Jehovah, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer." Again, He asks this question: "Is there a God besides me;" and then He answers it: "Yea, there is no God besides me; I know not any. Thus saith Jehovah, the King of Israel, and her Redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts; I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. Besides me there is no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I am Jehovah, and there is none else; there is no God besides me. Thus saith Jehovah, thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb, I am Jehovah, that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens above, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself." And this one and only God, Maker, Saviour and Redeemer, predicts thousands of times that he will come into the world to save and redeem the human race from an impending evil that threatened their total destruction. Let two passages on this subject suffice.

In the 9th Chapter and 9th verse of Zachariah, we have these words: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy King cometh unto thee. He is just, and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." Now, it is as clear as a sunbeam that Zion's King, who is Jehovah, God, could alone fulfill this prediction; and to do this, He must be in the world and in a human body. But in the New Scriptures we are informed that Jesus rode a colt, the foal of an ass, into the city of Jerusalem for the purpose of fulfilling this prediction. Again, we have this prediction in the 7th Chapter 14–25 of Isaiah: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel," and in the 9th Chapter and 6th verse of the same Prophet, the coming of Jehovah into the world is still more explicitly and unequivocally announced in these words: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a child is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the *Mighty God*, the *Everlasting Father*, the Prince of Peace." Now, in the first chapter of Matthew certain events that occurred prior to the Lord's birth, and communicated by the angel of the Lord to Joseph in a dream are given, and then it is stated that "all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." Again, the Apostle John declares that "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made"—thus plainly declaring that Jesus was the maker of all things. It is also recorded, that when the nine lepers who had gone to him to be healed, He told them to go show themselves to the priests, and, while on their way to the priests, they suddenly found themselves cleansed of their leprosy, and one of them turned back and glorified God, that is Jesus, with a loud voice, falling down at *His feet*, giving Him praise. Then, from this passage it is made as plain as possible, that this leper worshipped *Jesus* directly, as his God, and that Jesus accepted it as true worship. Again, the most remarkable passage in the whole New Scriptures is the inscription (in large Roman letters) over His head when he was crucified, to wit: "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews;" and, while Pilate was writing the inscription, some of the Jews said to him, "write not the King of the Jews, *but that He said He was*." Again Pilate asked the Lord himself this question: "Art thou King of the Jews?" and He replied, "*thou sayest*," that is, admitted that He (Jesus) was the King of the Jews, or Jehovah, God. Finally, after the Lord's crucifixion, ascension and complete glorification, the Apostle John, in the Revelations, says he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and he saw the Lord, and when he saw Him, he fell down at his feet as dead, and the Lord said unto him, "I am the First and the Last, and have the keys of hell and of death." Previously, He had said He was the Alpha and the Omega,—the beginning and the ending,—the Almighty.

Then, it is demonstrated clearly and fully, that Jesus is the identical Divine Being that acted as civil lawgiver for the Jewish people prior to *His coming into the world* by the assumption of a human body in the person of the Virgin Mary; and therefore it was Jehovah, God himself, the Maker of the Universe, Omnipotent and Omniscient, who drove the money-changers out of the temple at Jerusalem, and called them thieves and robbers, and they were called thieves and robbers because the exacting of increase was the taking of something without rendering an equivalent—a transaction called, in the English language, *stealing*, for the exacting of increase was the sole occupation of the money-changers in the temple, and, therefore, they could not be thieves and robbers unless the exacting of increase was stealing. And, this same Divine Being, prior to his assumption of human nature, and while acting as civil lawgiver for the Jewish people, prohibits the exacting of an increase of money by a plain, civil law, given in these words: "Thou shalt not take increase from thy neighbor of money, or food, or raiment," and in addition thereto, expressed his abhorrence of the character of this transaction in these words: "He that putteth forth his money upon increase and taketh increase is an abomination in my sight." And, yet, wonderful to say, every nation in Christendom, in the entire past and up to the present moment, have thought, and still think, directly opposite to their Maker concerning increase of money, for these nations *have legalized* the exacting of increase of money. Nor is this all these Christian people have done; their clergy, and their judges, and their lawyers, and their money-changers, and their politicians, all denounce, as thieves and robbers, the individuals who fail to comply with the demand of the money-changer for the increase of money. Then, it is evident that mankind, in thought about increase of money, are in direct antagonism to their Maker, and this implies perfect agreement with the devil concerning increase of money,—a singular and very unfortunate position for mankind to occupy, but a position of which they are profoundly ignorant.

Hence, in order more clearly to demonstrate that increase of money is fraudulent, as the Sacred Scriptures repeatedly and emphatically affirm, it is necessary to show how money is made—that is, what are the principles which impart to money its purchasing power; also, what constitutes money honest, and what makes money dishonest, for honest money of necessity implies dishonest money, since anything and everything has its opposite, and, in this programme, is included the *modus operandi* of money both honest and dishonest.

Now, money is obviously an invention, and invented to remove the insuperable difficulties in the exchanging of values that were continually occurring under the barter system, after the sub-division of labor, with increase both of variety and production, that obtained among mankind. Hence, the buying and selling system is evidently a substitute for the barter system, and the principles which exist in and constitute the barter system are identical with the principles which constitute the buying and selling system. But, while the principles which constitute each system are the same, they are applied differently. The principles of the barter system are applied directly, and applied by the owners of the values to be exchanged in their individual capacity, and, therefore, the values are exchanged directly. In the buying and selling system these same principles are applied by the owners of value in their collective capacity, and applied indirectly through a medium or proxy.. Hence, values in the buying and selling system are exchanged indirectly. In each system the first and essential principle is the equalizing of the values to be exchanged, since consent to exchange the values in question can not be obtained unless their owners suppose them to be equal. In the barter system each individual owner of value has his own standard of value, which is the amount of use that each individual assumes or supposes his property to perform; and, when it is determined that the use performed by the properties to be exchanged are equal, then this fact is communicated and the consent to exchange is given directly by each individual owner of the values. Hence, this mode of exchanging is direct, and called barter. But there are two essential conditions connected with both of these modes of swapping that must not be ignored. The first is this, that the exchanging of values in both systems must *be free of cost*, since it is evident that the exchanging of values is for the mutual benefit of the parties engaged therein. If this condition is not complied with, it is absolutely impossible to obtain value for value, since the cost can only be derived from the values exchanged, and therefore the values are decreased by said cost, and decreased in exact proportion to the amount of the cost. The second condition is, that the right to exchange our values must not be given to any second party. It is our birthright, and cannot be alienated without subjecting the owners and producers of value to the most ruinous consequences. In the barter system it is the property of individuals, and remains intact. In the buying and selling system, it *ought to be common property*,—the property of the owners and producers of value combined; but, unfortunately for them, in that system it was surrendered, and surrendered without receiving even a mess of pottage.

Now, in the buying and selling system, the exchanging of substances having value is effected through a medium, or proxy, which is a universal exchanger of all kinds and amounts of substances having value, and is, therefore, an instrument of obtain-ing all kinds and amounts of substances having value. Hence, money must either be a substance that represents all kinds of value, or a substance that has all kinds of value ; and since it is known that a substance having all kinds of value does not exist and can not be brought into existence ; hence, money, of necessity, must be a substance that represents all kinds of value. We therefore propose to show how the creation of money, which is a representative of all kinds of value, is effected, and we will illustrate this process of making money, by assuming a case, wherein three individuals have values to exchange, but cannot exchange them in accordance with their wishes under the barter system, yet can readily exchange them as they wish through the instrumentality of a proxy or medium called money, *i. e.*, exchange them indirectly. For brevity's sake, we call said individuals A, B and C. A has a horse, B has 100 bushels of wheat, and C has merchandise. A wishes to exchange his horse for a certain portion of C's merchandise, B wishes to exchange his wheat for A's horse, but C wants neither horse nor wheat, but wants something that will enable him to procure more merchandise. It is also assumed that the owners of said substances regard them as equal in value, yet it is evident that they cannot exchange them as they wish, by acting in accordance with the principles of the barter system—that is, exchange them directly. Now, it is known that in the buying and selling system a unit of value is assumed by the owners and producers of value in their collective capacity, for the purpose of equalizing or measuring the values of the substances which they wish to exchange, and that it is the common standard of value in all countries, and was assumed or taken from a certain specified amount of gold or silver, and called in this country, dollar. Then, in the case assumed, as the first step in the exchanging of substances having values in the barter system, is the equalizing the value of the substances to be exchanged, the first step in the creation of money, or a universal exchanger of values is, for A, B and C to equalize the values of their substances by the common standard of value. Hence, A makes or assumes the value of his horse to be equal to $100, and B values his wheat at $100, and C his merchandise at $100 ; then, upon the principle that things equal to to the same thing are equal to each other, the value of A's horse, and of B's wheat, and of C's merchandise, being each equal to the $100, are respectively equal or are equalized. Again, as the second step in the exchanging of substances having value in the barter system, is the communication of the fact that the values of the substances to be exchanged are equalized, therefore, the second step in the creation of money requires A, B and C to make known the same fact, to-wit : that the values of the substances to be exchanged have been also equalized, and equalized by the 100 units of value, and this is done indirectly by representing the 100 units of value or the $100 on some substance free of cost, say a piece of paper; for, this being done, this piece of paper would represent alike the value of A's horse, B's wheat, and C's merchandise, and would, therefore, represent the fact that said values were equalized, since said values being each represented as equal to the $100, are equal to each other or equalized. Then, as the third and last step in the exchanging of substances having value under the barter system, is the giving, on the part of the owners of said substances to be exchanged, their consent to an exchange of the substances whose values are equalized. Hence, the third and last step in the creation of a universal exchanger of value, is the giving of the universal consent of the owners of substances having value, to exchange said substances for the paper substance or substances whereon the amounts of the values to be exchanged are represented and equalized. Now, it is known that this universal consent to do this is obtained by law and made obligatory by law, and when obtained, these paper substances would become lawful money. For it is self-evident that if all the owners of substances having intrinsic value consent and obligate themselves to exchange said substances for paper substances, whereon the amounts of the intrinsic value of said substances are represented, in this case any one having a $100 paper note that represents the intrinsic value of any kind of substance to the amount of $100, could readily exchange it for any kind of substance having intrinsic value to the amount of $100, and the individual who exchanged a substance, having intrinsic value to the amount of $100 for the paper substance, that only *represented* intrinsic value to the amount of $100, could procure with this paper substance any kind of substance with intrinsic value to the amount of $100 that he desired. In this way, the $100 paper note becomes a perfect medium of exchanging any and all kind of substances having intrinsic value to the amount of $100. Hence, it is obvious that said $100 paper note, *representing* the intrinsic value of any kind of substance to the amount of $100, would readily exchange A's horse, and B's wheat, and C's merchandise in accordance with the wishes of their respective owners. For B could sell his wheat to a miller for a $100 paper note, and with it buy A's horse, and A could, with the $100 paper note, buy C's merchandise, and C could, with the aforesaid paper note, buy merchandise having intrinsic value equal to that represented on the paper note—said result being precisely what the owners of the values exchanged desired.

Now, it is obvious that since this case makes known the principles by which a paper substance or a silver or gold substance can be made money, it therefore involves and contains all of the facts and principles existing in the operations of money. Hence, a clear and accurate knowledge of the facts and principles involved and contained in said case will furnish us with clear and accurate knowledge of the operations of money. We propose, therefore, a rigid and minute analysis of the above case, in order to develop fully and clearly all of the facts and principles contained therein. Then the first fact, and very important fact exhibited in this case, is this: that the unit of value or standard of value, called dollar, is the chief instrument by which the thing called money is made. Hence, a knowledge definite and clear of the unit of value, what it is, how it performs its functions in the creation of money, is a matter of primary importance. Now, the value of any substance is the use which it performs, and the use which a certain specified amount of silver or gold performs, as ascertained by observation, has been assumed by mankind as the unit of value, or standard of value, for the purpose of equalizing or measuring the values of the substances they wish to exchange; because the unit of value is as necessary in determining or ascertaining the amounts of values as the yard-stick is necessary in ascertaining the dimensions of substances. And to distinguish the unit of value from all other values, as well as to indicate the peculiar use it performs, a specific name is given to it, and, as already stated, is, in this country, called *dollar*. Now, it is evident that the mental organs alone can take cognizance of the values or qualities of material substances. Therefore, the measuring of values by the unit of value is a mental operation, and implies a mental separation of the unit of value from the substance whence it is taken, and, as a material substance does not, and cannot, enter the human mind, but an *idea* of its value can, and does enter, and remains therein, therefore, the owners of substances containing value have the unit of value always on their minds, and use it to equalize or measure the values of the substances they wish to exchange. Now, it is well known that the ideas of things which exist in the mind are transferred from one mind to another through the agency of words, spoken or written, and that said ideas can be taken out of the mind and transferred to a material substance through the same medium—the medium of words. Hence, this idea of the amount of use performed by a specified amount of gold or silver, existing in the mind, is called dollar, and the word dollar being inscribed on a silver substance having the specified amount of substance from which the unit of value was assumed, then this operation transfers said idea, through the agency of the word dollar, from the mind to the silver substance, whereon the word dollar is inscribed, and the word dollar inscribed on the rim of said silver substance represents the amount of use performed by said silver substance when developed, while the *undeveloped value* of this same identical silver substance is represented by the bright color of said substance, upon the principle enumerated by the Apostle Paul, "The invisible things of this world are represented by its visible things"—the invisible things of the silver dollar being undeveloped value, and its visible thing its color. Hence, the new silver dollar has two distinct values connnected with it; one, its jewelry value, indissolubly connected therewith, and imparted by divine agency; the other, its exchanging value, and imparted by human agency, and removable at the pleasure of its creators. Now, one of the characteristics of this curious invention is this, that it is absolutely impossible to make it furnish but one of its two distinct values at the same time. If you used it for its jewelry value its exchanging value disappeared, but, if you used it for its exchanging value its jewelry value remained in a perfectly worthless and undeveloped state. Now, my readers, you have often heard it said that it was impossible to ride both sides of a sapling at the same time, but the devil who, as the Apostle Paul informs us, "goeth about seeking whom he may devour,"—*just like his invention, gold and silver money*—has induced mankind to do what is equivalent to that hitherto unaccomplished feat; for he has induced the entire human race, for thousands of years in the past, and still keeps them steadfast, in the belief that this undeveloped, and therefore worthless, value of the silver dollar, though costing all the time as much as the value it exchanges, and a value, too, which no one gets or wants, is actually the guarantee of the *honesty* of the silver dollar, or, in other words, the dishonesty of the silver dollar constitutes or guarantees its honesty, which looks very much like riding both sides of a sapling at the same time.

Again, it is well known that the silver dollar is universally supposed to be the standard of value, and assuming, as all financial men have done and still do, that the undeveloped value of the silver substance called a silver dollar, indissolubly connected with its substance, was the unit of value or common standard of value, they could not possibly avoid the conclusion arrived at. But the assumption being entirely false, as previously demonstrated, the conclusion was therefore wholly false. Hence, it is evident that the silver substance, called a silver dollar, is not the standard of value which is the universal belief of financial men, and all other men who entertain an opinion thereupon, but it is only an *exchanger of value*, and made so by the common standard of value or unit of value existing in the human mind, and used in a two-fold manner, first, to create a universal exchanger of substances having value, and, secondly, to price the substances they wish to exchange. And this false assumption of the money-changers concerning the silver dollar is the chief of the many causes that has produced the profound and universal ignorance that prevails in all countries concerning gold and silver money and its operations.

Again, as a silver substance is made money by the representation of the word dollar thereon, because the word dollar includes the three constituent principles of money, upon the principle that the part of a thing includes the whole of that thing, just as the whole of a thing includes all of its parts, then it follows that the word dollar inscribed upon a paper substance would make this paper substance money, and make it money upon the identical principle that the inscription of said word upon a silver substance makes said silver substance money, because the word dollar inscribed on the paper substance by the *same authority* and for the *same purpose* that caused the inscription of the word dollar, would have the same effect on the paper substance as it has on the silver substance—since similar causes produce similar effects. But the paper substance makes money that would be free of cost that is appreciable, and, being in the performance of the use for which it was created, would have but *one* value, to-wit, the money-value, and would, therefore, equalize all kinds of substance having value to the amount of one dollar—represent all kinds of substances having value to the amount of one dollar—and exchange these substances without diminishing their value.

Again, the purchasing power of paper money can be greatly increased without increase of cost. For instance: a piece of paper of the same size and quality that represents value to the amount of $500, exchanges value to the same amount, could also represent value to the amount of $500, since the three words five hundred dollars could be printed by machinery as readily as the two words one dollar, and on a piece of paper of the same size and, therefore, without any difference as to cost, whereas the increase of the purchasing power of gold and silver money involves a like increase of its cost, since $500 gold or silver money not only represents value to the amount of $500 and exchanges value to the amount of $500, but it also has intrinsic value to the amount of $500 and therefore costs $500. Hence, it is clearly demonstrated that the most important difference between gold and silver money, consists in the difference of the cost of the substances that have been made money—the one being free of cost, while the other has cost to the greatest extent possible.

Again, this case reveals another very important fact, which has been hitherto wholly ignored, to-wit: that money is common property—the property of the people. For the owners of lands and labor combined produce all kinds and all forms of value.

For all value whatever comes from Mother Earth through the agency of labor, and these two classes combined are the people of a country; and they alone create money to exchange the value which they alone produce. So the people of any country have a two-fold right, and an inalienable right, which is a God-bestowed right, to property in money, since the power to produce value and the right to own value implies and carries with it the right to exchange the value produced and owned. But it is known that the right of the people who create money to its ownership is called communism by the few who have a monopoly of money—a word that, in the mind of the monopolist, means anything and everything that is monstrous and horrible. But the reverse of this is the fact, as is clearly demonstrated by this simple illustration: Suppose ten individuals purchase a mule, each one paying the same amount, then, evidently, the mule is common property. But suppose two of the ten contrive to get a law enacted giving them, who are the few, the sole right to the mule, with the exclusive privilege of *hiring* the mule to the *eight*, who are the *many*. Now, any one and every one having a sane mind can not fail to perceive and admit that this proceeding on the part of the two individuals, *though legalized*, is an open and utter and monstrous violation of every principle of justice, divine or human. Now, the monopoly of money by a few individuals is precisely identical to the above case, for they have obtained, by law, a monopoly of money, which is evidently the property of the people, since they alone create it, and create it for the sole purpose of exchanging their value, and, in addition thereto, they create it with the intention and expectation that in exchanging their values it shall, and will give value for value; and yet, in dispite of all this, through the agency of this monopoly, the monopolists have perpetrated, upon the producers of value, a fraud that is without a parallel, or even an approximation thereto, in the whole history of human fraud. For those that perpetrated the fraud, and those upon whom the fraud was perpetrated, are alike profoundly ignorant of the fraudulent character of gold and silver money, both parties being alike blinded by its wonderful accumulative power. But still, the party defrauded feels that a most grievous wrong has been inflicted upon them by those that have a monopoly of money; and this is inevitable, for, though blind as to the real cause of this great wrong, they could not fail to see that while they produced all kinds and all forms of value in vast abundance, yet vast numbers of the producing class were continually in want—the most urgent—of what they had actually made, and made in "the sweat of their faces,"—but, at the same time, they perceived, with equal clearness, that those who had a monopoly of money had an abundance, an overwhelming abundance, of that *very wealth* which they *had not created.* So they could not possibly *avoid perceiving* that the monopolist of money, like the rich man spoken of in the Sacred Scriptures, was clothed in purple and fine linen, and *fared sumptuously every day*, while they, who had a *monopoly* of the *production of value*, were, like Lazarus, "clothed in rags, and so destitute as to be both thankful and glad to get even the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table." Hence, the exposure of this fraud, in the operations of gold and silver money is a matter of *profound interest* to the whole human race.

But, to make this exposure is an undertaking that brings us to what is termed the "almighty dollar," which is either gold or silver, or both. Now, the Apostle Paul was divinely authorized to declare that the "love of money is the root of *all evil*," and the love of money is evidently excited in the human mind alone by the accumulative power of money, since this characteristic of money gives to the owners of money wealth and honor and glory and power—things which the human heart craves more than all other things—and gives these things without much effort, mental or bodily, on the part of the recipient. It was the Pandora's box of the Ancients which, when opened, flooded the whole earth *with every form of evil.* It is a perfect enigma; everybody uses it, and everybody wants it, but what are its operations, save that it is a universal exchanger of value, has been in the entire past, and is, up to the present moment, a profound secret.

Now, obviously, one cause of this mystery about money arises from the assumption that money, in the exchanging of value, gives value for value, while the known facts connected with the use of money can not possibly be made to harmonize with this assumption. Take this case as an illustration of the utter impossibility of reconciling the assumption of the honesty of money with the facts resulting from the use of it: The newspapers state that a manufacturer of tobacco in the city of New York made in one year $300,000 *clear of all expenses.* Now, this expression "*clear of all expenses*," means that the last dollar requisite in the manufacturing of said tobacco and advanced by this man was *returned* to him at the end of the year by the laborers employed, and returned from the increased value given to the tobacco by their work thereupon, and that the $300,000 he received came from the same source, being the net profits of their labor for the entire year; and instances of this sort, in vast numbers are of constant occurrence in this country and in all civilized countries. But it is evident that it is absolutely impossible to reconcile such monstrous results with the assumption that gold and silver money gives value for value.

Again: Let us take a case in which the operations of the so-called honest money are exhibited upon a much larger scale. By order of the parliament of Great Britain the statistics of the daily incomes of every man and woman in that whole country were taken. And the result, as published in the newspapers, was this: Five hundred thousand people had daily incomes from $50,000 down to $5; *nine millions* of people had two shillings daily, and *eighteen millions* had only one shilling daily. And it is well known that these twenty-seven millions of people constitute that class whose labor alone produce the wealth of a country. They, then, are the workers in the hive who make all of the honey, while the half million are non-producers of value, and therefore are the drones in the hive, who do not make a particle of honey, yet get all of the honey, made by the workers, saving and excepting a small pittance, *barely sufficing* to *keep them alive*, in *order* to keep them at *work*. Just think of it, my readers! One individual of the half million of the *non-producers of value* received daily, according to these statistics, *four hundred thousand* times more than *any one of eighteen millions of producers of value*. Then, how is it possible for any one to believe that gold and silver money, which *alone* through its operations, produced such infernal and appalling extremes of poverty and wealth *can be honest!* How can money give value for value when it takes the overwhelming portion of the value it exchanges? Now, the one is the assumption or theory, and the other is the fact. It is *impossible* to reconcile them. Then, it is the dictate of common sense that the theory is false, wholly false, if it contradicts the facts; and this I propose to demonstrate. But, to do this, it is absolutely necessary to analyze and examine minutely and fully both the facts and assumed facts connected with this mysterious and *all-powerful* dollar, but *all powerful only for evil*, and while some of these facts have been previously stated, it is very important to have all of the facts and assumed facts in a connected series, hence it becomes a necessity to re-state some of the important facts already stated. Now, the fact appertaining to money, that has brought about the fraud in money, and the mystery about the operations of money, is the double value of money—has two distinct values at the same time—the one intrinsic and the other extrinsic. The intrinsic value is imparted by Divine agency and consists in its capacity to make various kinds of jewelry and various kinds of tableware; also, watches and a variety of other things, such as we see in a jewelry store. But the extrinsic value is imparted by human agency and consists in its capacity to exchange all kinds of value. Now, while htese two distinct values appertain to the same substance, it can, not be made to furnish but one of its values at the same time.

If you get the value imparted by Divine agency, its capacity to exchange values ceases to exist. But if you make this substance perform the use imparted by human agency, you *do* not and can not get the use which the maker of this substance intended it to perform, but its capacity to perform this use, which is called its intrinsic value, remains intact in an undeveloped or worthless state, called a state of potency. Now, the silver substance called a silver dollar, is used, as every person knows, as money, and has the unit of value called dollar represented upon it, and has value to the amount of one dollar, because it is composed of the identical amount of silver substance from which the unit of value was taken or assumed. Hence, the silver substance called a silver dollar has intrinsic value to the amount of one dollar, represents value to the amount of one dollar, and exchanges value to the amount of one dollar, and therefore costs one dollar. Hence, when the silver dollar is given in exchange for any substance having value to the amount of one dollar, *it appears* as if the exchange occurred on *the ground of the intrinsic value* of the silver dollar, since the intrinsic values of the substances exchanged are equal, each amounting to one dollar. Hence the advocates of gold and silver money, *because* of this appearance, affirm that said silver dollar gives value for value. But this appearance is like the phenomenon that daily occurs in the world of nature, to-wit: It appears that the sun moves around the earth once in every twenty-four hours, but it is known that this appearance is not true or real, but the reverse of it is true; *the earth moves*, has a *double motion*, *revolves* on its axis once in twenty-four hours, which causes *the appearance* of the sun moving around the earth once in twenty-four hours; it also moves around the sun at the same time, going entirely around it once in twelve months. It is also known that this *double* motion of the earth deceived everybody up to the time of Galileo, for every one, *judging from the appearance*, supposed that the *sun* moved around the earth. Now, it is this double value of the silver dollar that has produced a similar result, for its advocates, judging from the appearance, affirm that it gives intrinsic value for intrinsic value, but this assertion is not true, since it is well known that no one wants or gets its intrinsic value. For every farmer *knows* that when he exchanges a bushel of wheat for a silver dollar he does not get, nor does he want the jewelry value or intrinsic value of the silver dollar, of course; then he gets its extrinsic value and exchanging value which has the capacity of procuring him any kind of value he may want, and value equal to the value of his bushel of wheat; also, every owner of labor, without a single exception, knows that when he exchanges a day's labor for a silver dollar, he neither wants or gets the intrinsic or jewelry value of the silver dollar, but he exchanges his labor for the silver dollar *because he knows* that he can, with the silver dollar, get any kind of value he wants to the amount of one dollar, and, therefore, gets value equivalent to the value of his day's labor; therefore, the *appearance* that we exchange our values for the intrinsic value of the silver dollar is not real, but *the reality is* that we exchange our values for the silver dollar solely on the ground of its extrinsic or exchanging value, since, on this ground, it acts as a representative of value. Hence, the silver dollar is used alone on account of its extrinsic value, but while thus used it carries with it its *intrinsic value* in an undeveloped and therefore useless state, which no one wants or gets. Therefore, the *very important* question to be determined is, for which of these two distinct values of the silver dollar do the money-lenders exact increase? for the value which is not used, or for the value which is used—for its intrinsic value, or for the extrinsic value? Now, the cost of exchanging value and the exacting of increase are synonymous terms, and it is known that the silver substance on which the purchasing power of money is placed has intrinsic value to the amount of one dollar, and therefore *costs* one dollar. But cost can not be predicated of the purchasing power or extrinsic value of the silver dollar, since it is created by the universal consent of the owners and producers of values to do certain things, and cost can not be predicated of human consent, since it is free of cost. Hence, it is evident that the money-lenders exact increase for the intrinsic value of the silver dollar, a value which no one wants or gets; and it is also evident that this cost of the silver dollar can only be taken from the value it exchanges, since there is no other source from which it can be derived.

Again: These two distinct values of the silver dollar have two distinct owners. The extrinsic value is really the property of the producers of value, though not in their possession, since it was created by them alone, and created only to exchange their values, and exchange them without cost; but the intrinsic value of the silver dollar is the property of the money-lender, since the substance called silver bullion is owned by them, when converted into silver dollars by the Government, the agent of the producers of value, who are the people; and this conversion of silver bullion into silver dollars is effected at the *mint* by the agency of the *Government stamp*, and consists in inscribing the word dollar on the rim of the silver substance having a circular form and a specified weight and size, and means that the silver substance, called a silver dollar, represents value to the amount of one dollar, exchanges value to the amount of one dollar, and costs one dollar. Hence, when the extrinsic value of the silver dollar which, by creation, is the property of the producers of value, is imparted or placed upon the silver substance, which is the property of the money-lender, it becomes the property of the money-lender. Hence, the money-lender, as the owner of the silver substance made money, has absolute control of both of its values, and uses only one of its values, but uses that value which he has artfully and unjustly taken from the producers of value, and uses it to decrease their values while exchanging their values, and decreases their values solely on the ground of the intrinsic value of the silver dollar—*the money-lender's value*, but a value which no one wants or gets. I re-assert that the purchasing power of money has been artfully and unjustly obtained from the producers of value, because the owners of gold and silver money and its advocates have induced the producers of value, by resonings *based* upon the appearances of truth, to believe that said gold and silver money, in *exchanging* their values, gives value for value, whereas, the facts resulting from the use of this money clearly demonstrate the falsity of this assumption of the money-lender, and the first and most conspicuous of all the facts connected with the use of money is the exacting of increase of money. Now, we have already shown that increase of money is exacted solely on account of the intrinsic value of the silver dollar, a *value* which no one wants or can get so long as the silver dollar is used as money, and therefore increase of money is exacted without rendering any equivalent. It is true that the money-lender assumes that increase of money is exacted on account of the cost of the silver substance made money, and it is also true that the silver substance made money did cost one dollar; but the owner of this substance voluntarily carried it to the mint, and voluntarily had this substance converted into money; and in doing this he also pledged himself not to use said intrinsic value since he pledged himself only to use its exchanging value, for he knew that it was absolutely impossible for him or anybody else to use both values at the same time. In addition to this he also pledged himself that this silver substance, made money by his voluntary act, in performing its functions as money, should comply with the great law of money and the great rule of honesty, to-wit: give value for value; and the Government of this country, as the agent of the people, in imparting to this silver substance its exchanging value, called its purchasing power, is also pledged to enforce a compliance with this double pledge on the part of the lender of the silver dollar.

Now, it is known that the institutions called banks are created by the Government solely for the purpose of furnishing the money whereby values are exchanged, and it is also known that these operations are confined simply to the loaning of money of which they have a monopoly. It is also known that the *monopoly of borrowing* is also confined to a small class, while the great mass of the producers of value have not the privilege of borrowing, *they* have the *exclusive privilege* of producing value, and of *paying* the *increase of money*; for the borrowers of money get said increase from the values produced by the owners of land and labor, and pays it to the lender of money. So the increase of money comes ultimately from the owners of land and labor, since they combined alone produce all kinds and all forms of value, and, of course, their values are decreased in exact proportion to the increase of money. Then, having ascertained the ratio according to which increase of money is exacted, we will then know the ratio according to which value is decreased by the exacting of the increase of money.

In 1878, upon personal inquiry, it was ascertained that the banks in the city of Richmond loaned money at the rate of fifteen per cent., sixty days' time. Now, any amount of money at just half of this rate, compounding every twelve months, will double itself in ten years. Then, one dollar at seven and a half per cent., compounding once in a year, will, in four hundred years, double itself forty times, and one dollar doubled forty times amounts to $1,099,511,627,775. So that this one dollar, at the above rate, adds to itself in four hundred years $1,099,511,627,774—*grows, but grows* to this vast extent by decreasing value to this same vast extent, without giving the slightest equivalent.

What a wonderful compound of thief, laborer and mystery "the Father of all Lies" makes of the silver dollar!—endows it with the capacity of adding to itself in four hundred years $1,099,511,627,774, *like unto itself* in every respect, *takes the whole* of this inconceivable amount from value while exchanging it, and takes it, too, without *giving the slightest equivalent for it—takes it*, while its owner, and the owners of the value it takes, are alike profoundly ignorant of the *intensely fraudulent character* of its operations—endows it with the capacity of working without food or raiment; works without wages, and, therefore, never strikes; works *six* days in the week, but *steals, unceasingly*, the *entire seven*; steals night and day; never slumbers or sleeps; never gets sick; neither war or pestilence or famine *affects or modifies* or *stays*, for a moment, its infernal operations; and since, in the opinion of financial men, it has the capacity of continuing its wonderful operations for twelve hundred years, in this time its stealings, at seven and a half per cent., compounding every twelve months, would suffice to purchase the entire planetary system with every form and kind and amount of value thereupon. Here, then, my readers, you can find in these *unjust* and mysterious operations of the silver dollar, a true solution of the two appalling extremes of poverty and wealth—a state of poverty verging upon starvation to the millions who, in compliance with the Divine injunction, "earn their bread in the sweat of their faces," but wealth, overwhelming wealth, to the few that evade a compliance with this Divine injunction by having a monopoly of money with its wonderful accumulating power, for this accumulative power of the silver dollar, combined with its monopoly power, mysteriously and unjustly takes the overwhelming portion of the value which the millions produce and gives it to a few non-producers of value, or drones, without rendering the slightest equivalent for it. Hence, the half million of non-producers of value in the kingdom of Great Britain were, according to statistics, in the possession of the vast wealth produced by twenty-seven millions of producers of value, while they, with their children, were in a state of extreme poverty—a state verging upon starvation.

We propose now to show what are the means used to effect this wonderful increase of the silver dollar. Now, it is well known that when the owner of silver bullion carries it to the mint, and has it converted into money thereat, he obligates himself that said money, in the exchanging of value, shall give value for value, which necessarily implies that the silver dollar shall not decrease value while exchanging it. Of course he also obligates himself to use said bullion converted into money only as money, and this obligates and compels him to keep the silver substance whereon the purchasing power of money is placed in its undeveloped, worthless state. Hence, from these unquestioned facts connected with the silver dollar, this important fact is brought to light, or evolved, to wit: *that the only possible use* that the silver substance made money *does* or *can perform* is, to *carry* around and about, from place to place, and from person to person, the word dollar inscribed on its rim; for this single word, as already demonstrated, combines and represents the constituent principles of money. Hence, it is made manifest why the purchasing power of money was placed upon that identical amount of silver or gold substance, from which the unit of value, or standard of value, was assumed or taken. It was placed thereupon to *create a two-fold basis*—one for the assumption that the silver dollar, in the exchanging of value, gives value for value—the other as a *pretext* for *exacting increase*; and it is well known that the advocates of gold and silver money *do base* their assumption of its honesty upon the *existence* of its *intrinsic* value; and it has been already domonstrated, beyond all question and above all doubt, that the exacting of increase is alone on the ground of the intrinsic or jewelry value of the silver or gold dollar.

We come now to the doubling process of the silver dollar, which, of course, implies that it increases or grows in a geometrical ratio, and therefore, decreases value in the same proportion, since it is ultimately but indirectly derived from value. Then, this question comes up for solution, how has this growth of the silver dollar been brought about in the face of the fact, and a self-evident fact, that its growth or increase is absolutely impossible, and a fact perceived and admitted by every man and woman, not idiotic or insane, and this fact also implies that the silver dollar is utterly devoid of the slightest appearance of growth? And the only answer to this question that it is possible to give is, that the intrinsic value of the silver dollar was the *instrument* in accomplishing this greatest of all known or conceivable frauds, the *growth of the silver dollar;* for it was obviously accomplished by allowing the owner of the silver dollar to be paid for the cost of the silver bullion, whereon the purchasing power was placed, and this was obviously allowed, and allowed by law, on the ground that the silver bullion, converted into money, or a silver dollar, has intrinsic value to the amount of one dollar; and it is a well known fact that increase and the cost of exchanging value have the same meaning. It is also known that the cost of exchanging value or increase is obtained alone from value, and obtained *indirectly* in the *form of money;* but the enactors of said law of course presumed that the owner of said silver dollar would take the cost only once, for if he took it twice he would take more than he claimed or asked, and more than he was entitled to, and more than he was allowed. The enactors of said law were also ignorant of the fact that the owner and lender of the silver dollar was debarred by *his own voluntary act* from *claiming* or *asking* for the cost of his silver dollar since he, *prior* to his petition for cost, by his own voluntary act in getting his silver bullion converted into money, rendered or made the intrinsic value of said bullion utterly worthless, said act being similar to that of a man who insures his house, then burns it down and then claims the insurance.

Again: The owner and lender of the silver dollar not only sets up a false claim for the cost of his silver dollar, but when allowed it, assumes that the law that allowed him to take said cost once, allowed him the privilege of taking it indefinitely and to the extent that his covetousness prompted him to demand, and the wants of the borrower *compelled* him to allow; and it is an undeniable fact that the owner and lender of the silver dollar acts upon this assumption, and that he exacts the cost in such a manner that he makes the cost of the silver dollar double itself; and since the cost of anything and everything is paid in money, then he makes the silver dollar double itself, and since this implies or means increase, then he makes his dollar INCREASE *or* GROW, and, of course, doubles itself in certain periods of time, according to the rate of growth assumed.

We propose now to express, in words, this hitherto unknown operation of money, indicated in the doubling of the silver dollar, as in example just given; and to facilitate this undertaking, we call the original or parental dollar No. 1, and the dollars it adds to itself, in their successive order, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, &c., &c. Then, in ten years No. 1 adds to itself dollar No. 2; but this addition is effected by taking value to the amount of one dollar from the values exchanged by No. 1, and taken on the ground of the cost of the jewelry value of No. 1, and being converted into money, becomes the instrument of stealing another dollar in the second ten years, just as it was stolen in the first ten years by No. 1. In the beginning of the second ten the owner of No. 1 has two dollars to loan, No. 1 and 2, and they steal each one dollar from the values exchanged by them, and being converted into money, become No. 3 and No. 4, and at the end of the second ten years come, in company with No. 1 and No. 2, to the owner of No. 1 and No. 2. Hence, at the beginning of the third ten, the owner of No. 1 and No. 2 has four dollars to loan, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4, and at the end of the third ten, four more dollars are added, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7, No. 8, and upon the identical principle that No. 1 added to itself No. 2 and No. 3, and No. 2 added to itself No. 4. So, in the three series, dollar No. 1 steals seven dollars in thirty years, three directly and four indirectly, through its thievish offspring, that is, its cost is taken from value seven distinct times in thirty years—thus making a clear steal of seven dollars in said time. In four hundred years the cost of one dollar at seven and a half per cent., compounding every twelve months, is taken directly or indirectly 1,099,511,-627,774 times, and the whole of this vast amount of silver dollars is taken from the values exchanged without rendering the slightest equivalent to the owners thereof, since it is taken solely on the ground of the intrinsic or undeveloped value of this one silver dollar and its thievish offspring—a value which the owners of the values exchanged, which they never get or want. In four hundred years its cost is taken from value 1,099,511,-627,774 times, and the whole of this vast amount is derived from value without rendering the slightest equivalent to the owners thereof, since it is taken solely on the ground of the cost of its intrinsic or undeveloped value—a value which the owners of the values diminished thereby, neither get nor want, nor the owners of the silver dollar can possibly give; nor does this tell the whole story, bad as it is. The property of the people, to-wit: the purchasing power of the silver dollar, by cunning and by treachery obtained, is used to effect this glaring and unparalleled robbery—a robbery which defies the languages of "all people and nations and tongues" to furnish words that suffice to characterize it.

Now, it becomes plain, from this doubling process of money effected by compounding the increase at short intervals, how this periodical scarcity of money, and the shrinkage of values consequent thereupon, are brought about; for, supposing one billion of dollars to be in the banks and one billion in circulation, then the billion in the banks being loaned out at six per cent. per annum and compounding every sixty days, said billion in about thirteen years will double itself; and when the owners of the billion loaned collect it, as they invariably do, and also collect its increase, which likewise they surely do, if possible, then the billion loaned and the billion in circulation, both being in the possession of the owners of the banks, what inevitably is brought about?—a *great scarcity* of money; and what next?—a great shrinkage of values of every kind and form, and *buying* and *selling comes nearly* to a "standstill;" all of the manufacturing establishments all over the country compelled either to suspend their operations altogether or curtail said operations to a great extent; vast numbers of the labor class are dismissed or forced to submit to a reduction of wages, or strike; merchants in large numbers made bankrupts—the balance live upon their past earnings, or eke out a scanty subsistance, wishing and hoping for better times. Now, just such a state of things occurred in 1872–'3, and just such a state of things exist at the present time, and have been in existence for several months; and the inquiry all over the whole country is, what is the matter? What is the cause or causes of the dreadful scarcity of money, and the great shrinkage of all kinds and forms of value, and the great depression of trade in all its branches?—and the general answer to these enquiries is over-production of value; an answer obviously as far from the truth as it is possible to get, for it is self-evident that there are vast numbers of people all over this country that would and could gladly and readily consume this excess of value if they had the money to purchase it, and the manufacturers who are glutted with goods because the merchants who would buy their goods cannot sell them, and cannot sell them because the people who want their goods have no money to buy them. So, the real answer to this question is the scarcity of money, and the scarcity of money is alone produced by the collection of interest or increase of money. But, amid all this suffering and destitution and worry, and anxiety, the bank man sits serene and calm, and looks as innocent as a lamb. No scarcity of money disturbs his equanimity. His bank is glutted and gorged with money, and this he admits, and when asked what is the cause of all this trouble, answers promptly, "loss of confidence," by which they mean, if they have a definite idea of the expression, that the amount in circulation is so small that it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to get back the money loaned with its increase. Under these circumstances they lose confidence, and therefore cease to lend, or, if they do lend, it is only to those who give ample *security*, with the assurance that the money loaned will be promptly returned when called for. Again: It is known that money panics occur at intervals of twelve or thirteen years. A money panic occurred in 1872-'3, it comes again in 1884-'5—another interval of twelve or thirteen years.

Now, it is known that the currency in this country amounts to two billions; and supposing that a billion was out of the bank in circulation, and a billion in the bank; then, supposing the billion in the bank to be loaned at six per cent., coumpounding every sixty days, then, the billion loaned, if collected with its increase between twelve and thirteen years, will bring both the billion loaned and the billion in circulation back into the bank at said interval, so that the bringing back of the money in circulation between twelve and thirteen years involves the two-fold fact that the money in bank is equal to the money in circulation, and that the rate of increase is six per cent., sixty days' time. Then, the larger portion of the currency being in the banks, as a matter of course, there is a very small amount of it in circulation, and the result is what is called a money-panic; a great scarcity of money and with the great scarcity of money we have, as a necessary effect, a great shrinkage of values of all forms and kinds, along with the many other and all other evil consequences that are known to co-exist with and during the money-panic. Now, there is but *one way* whereby the excess of currency in the banks can be put in circulation. It is evident that it can not be loaned until the *confidence* of the owners of the currency is restored, and that is restored by *investing* a portion of the money in the banks, with which they are "glutted and gorged." So, they invest a billion in houses and lots in the cities and various other kinds of desirable property, and this billion being put in circulation, the bank men regain their confidence; and to show that a potential reason exists for the investment at this particular time in connection with the wish of the bank man to get the increase of his money, it is simply necessary to re-state a statement made by a financial paper in the city of New York during the prevalence of the money-panic in 1872-'3. The statement is as follows: "To show the dreadful extent of the shrinkage of values of all values that has been brought about by the contraction of the currency, the statement of this single fact will suffice, to-wit: a notable house and lot in this city sold, in flush times, for $50,000 cash—to-day it sold for $5,000 cash." Then, in this condition of things the banks invest, say a billion of their money in valuable property, depressed to the lowest point; and then having invested about half of the money in the banks, commence loaning the other half, and this being accomplished, what are called flush times come about and the bank man's *lost confidence comes back to him.* Hence, it is demonstrated that the exacting of increase alone brings about what are called money-panics, which, of course, involves an extreme contraction of the currency, and it also demonstrates that it is the real cause of the other extreme—the expansion of the currency; for, it is well known that the one is invariably succeeded by the other, just as night and day, which are two extremes, invariably follow each other, but *produced* by the *same cause*—the revolution of the earth on its axis. But the bank men *alone* get the benefit of both extremes; since, in the first extreme, they get the whole of the currency that is in circulation—say a *billion*—without giving the slightest equivalent for it, and besides, get back their billion loaned It is true they claim that they give full value for that extra billion they bring back in company with the billion loaned, and this full value which they claim to give is *the intrinsic* or *jewelry value* of the billion loaned. But *this say* is evidently a mistake, since this intrinsic or jewelry value came back with the billion loaned *in it* and *indissolubly connected* with it, and therefore they did not and could not give it to any one, nor did any one get it or want it. It is true that this billion loaned, while in circulation, did perform a very important use; it bought and sold; was the instrument of exchanging one value for another; but this use called the purchasing power, the people, through their agent, the Government, *gave to it;* so the people that used the purchasing power of said billion loaned were actually using their own property, one of the double values of the silver dollar; but the bank men also use this same money to buy and sell. Since they collect the billion that was loaned and bring with it the billion that was in circulation, in consideration of the cost of the intrinsic value in the billion loaned, and by this operation bringing about an extreme contraction of the currency, then *they buy* and *buy* the most valuable kinds and forms of property, *reduced* by *their own act* to the lowest point of depression.

Now, bear in mind, that buying property puts money in circulation, and is called investing, and therefore the bank men or money men having, by the operation called buying or investing, put a billion of currency in circulation, proceed to loan the billion in bank, which puts the larger portion of the currency in circulation, and then, and not till then, the bank men can *sell*, and do SELL, I suppose, to some extent, the property they bought when money was scarce and property was low. Hence, the purchaser of that notable house and lot in the city of New York having bought it for $5,000 cash, owing to the contraction of the currency, could readily sell it for $50,000 cash when the currency was expanded. Hence, it is evident that the Devil's idea concerning the use of money has been the instrument of organizing and legalizing a vast system of mystery, fraud and cunning combined, of such a character as to defy the combined intellect of mankind to comprehend its operations; but, at the same time, has induced the whole world to believe that gold and silver money, in its operations, complies with the great law of money and the great rule of honesty.

Now, the Lord's idea concerning the use of money is expressed in these words: "Thou shalt not take of thy neighbor increase of money, or food, or raiment," and constituted under the Jewish dispensation a plain, civil law; and His opinion of the atrocious principles involved in the exacting of increase is contained in and expressed by these words: "He that putteth forth his money upon increase, and *taketh increase*, is an *abomination in my sight.*" It is then evident that the exacting of increase of money is the principle *condemned* in the use of money; and since the intrinsic value of the substance made money is the basis or pretext upon which the exacting of increase is founded, therefore, in order to exempt the substance made money from the principle that brings about the exacting of increase of money, it must be destitute of intrinsic value; and, as we have already demonstrated that a paper substance, such as is now used to make what is called greenback money, but which is only a promise to pay money, is the most suitable substance whereon the purchasing power of money can be placed. Then, this being accomplished, a paper dollar would perform the functions of money upon the identical principles that the silver dollar performes them, to-wit: it would equalize, represent and exchange all kinds and forms of value to the amount of one dollar, but would be free of cost that was appreciable, and would become common property; but admit its cost would be one cent, then, in four hundred years it would exchange the same amount of value that the silver dollar could, and upon the identical principle, the only difference being in the cost. The cost of the silver dollar in that time at seven and a half per cent., compounding every twelve months, amounting to $1,099,511,627,774, whereas the paper substance being used in accordance with the *Lord's idea, without increase*, would cost only forty cents! Since, supposing the cost to be one cent, and that it would require renewal forty times—once in ten years—therefore the cost would be *forty cents in four hundred years.*

But, as we have seen that the Lord's idea about the use of money, if adopted and acted upon, will become a great instrument in furnishing in abundance the necessaries of life and the means of education, and this is perceived by knowing what its opposite has done, to wit: the Devil's idea concerning the use of money, which, to some extent, has been presented. Hence, I propose that the people of this country, through their agent, the Government, demonetize gold and silver money and place the purchasing power of money upon paper substances; in other words, make *greenback money* instead of a promise to pay money. I propose, also, that the people of this country adopt the other plain civil laws, constituting, if adopted, an absolutely perfect form of civil government, said civil laws being given to the Jewish people by the Maker of the Universe, while acting as their king and lawgiver—the *giver* of laws, *civil* as well as spiritual, and these laws being adopted, the Lord will, through the principles contained in said laws, *govern us in civil affairs in the place of the Devil* who *now governs* us, because we have in our Constitution six civil laws directly opposite to those civil laws given by the Divine Lawgiver to the Jewish people; and it is a tremendous and important fact, that, whether we think it or not, we are absolutely compelled, by the unchangeable laws of our being, to be governed on both planes of life—natural and spiritual—either by the Lord or the Devil, for the Lord said that ye cannot serve two masters—masters directly opposite in their nature—ye can not serve God and the Devil at the same time. Of course I am fully aware that this proposition involves the greatest and the most *radical revolution* that *was ever contemplated;* but it implies a change from the *very worst* to the *very best*—a change, therefore, the most *desirable.* Of course this proposition involves the abolishment of parties as they at present exist. We propose to have but one party, called the people's party, with the motto: The Lord and the people against the Devil and the money power; for the Lord said: "Without me ye can do nothing." Of course, then, it would be the excess of stupidity to undertake this more than Herculean task without Divine assistance, and the only possible way to be assured of Divine assistance is *to act upon Divine principles.*

Again, it is known that the political parties at present in existence antagonize each other, and that a vast deal of hate and contempt and mutual abuse and defamation of the principles and motives and persons of the respective parties exist, and are allowed and practised in both political parties. It is equally well known that the chief end of the leaders of both parties is to get the lucrative and honorable positions appertaining to the General Government. The *outs* wish to become the *ins* and the *ins* wish to *stay in*. Hence, the great and bitter struggle between the two has reference *alone* to the offices bestowed by the head of the Government, the President. Now, this antagonism that exists between the two political parties is precisely the kind of antagonism that exists in hell. Since each inhabitant of that very disagreeable place is continually engaged in worrying each other in every shape, manner and form conceivable and possible, and the "torments of hell" consist of this mutual worrying, together with the punishments inflicted upon the offenders, *but inflicted with a view* to their amendment—*that is*, to make them cease worrying each other, in order that each one may have some degree of enjoyment. *We, therefore, propose to discard this feature* of the present political parties, by acting as one party, and therefore act in harmony; and the great end of this party we propose shall be to place in the Constitution, as fundamental civil laws, the six Divine civil laws given by the Divine Lawgiver to the Jewish nation. Of couse, this action involves a repeal of the civil laws opposite thereto, and involves the serving of the Lord in civil matters on the natural plane, and therefore ceasing to *serve the Devil* in these same civil matters on this same plane of life; and in this opinion I well know that I am in direct opposition to the entire political world since everybody thinks (and the political world includes everybody) that neither the Lord nor the Devil has anything to do with politics, and an opinion opposite to this is regarded as *fanatical*. Now, we desire to call the attention of *everybody* to this *undeniable* fact, to-wit: that it is the fixed and unchangeable law of the human mind that *everybody* must think what is good and true, or think what is evil and false; but the good and the true come from heaven or the Lord, while the evil and the false come from hell or the Devil, and, as a rule, *everybody* acts as he thinks. Hence, everybody has the power or capacity from this law of his mind to think and act with the Lord or the Devil; and I repeat that everybody must think and act in this question with the one or the other, since there does not exist an *intermediate* principle between the affirmative and negative principle on any question.

Now, it is in accordance with reason, and the plain teachings of the Sacred Scriptures authorize us to believe that the great and highest end of the Divine Being in the creation of the planetary system was to make a heaven from the human race. Hence, it is evident that the great and highest end of all human governments would be to promote, as far as possible, this great end of the Maker of all things; and it is alike evident that human governments would promote this great end to the greatest extent possible or conceivable, by the adoption of the aforesaid six Divine civil laws, and this would be serving the Lord in political matters and ceasing to serve the Devil therein. Hence, *everybody* is in this dilemma, whether he thinks it or not, and from which there is no possibility of escape—that, in political matters he must serve either God or the Devil.

We will proceed now to show how this fictitious increase of money operates in diminishing the value of the products of the farmer; and we will suppose that a farmer carried his crop of tobacco to the city of Richmond in 1878, when the banks of said city, as I have already stated, were loaning money at the rate of twelve and fifteen per cent., sixty days' time. Suppose, too, that this farmer valued his crop at $1,000, and suppose, too, that it was a fair valuation, considering the cost of producing it, would he, or could he obtain this amount for his tobacco? He could not, for two reasons: In the first place the tobacco-buyers, as a rule, borrow money of the banks for the purpose of purchasing tobacco; and supposing a certain tobacco-buyer, wishing to buy said crop, and borrowing $1,000 for this purpose of the bank for one year, he would give his negotiable note, with a good endorser, for the $1,000, said note being made payable in twelve months, but he would only get $850—$150 being deducted for increase or interest or the cost of exchanging value. Of course, then, he could not give him a $1,000, since this might result in a clear loss to the buyer of $150; but would he give him the $850? He would not, and could not, for he bought the tobacco to make a profit thereupon, to which he is entitled. Then he must reduce the price of the tobacco by another $150, since this buyer has the same right to exact increase for the money with which he buys this tobacco as the bank man has who furnished this money *indirectly for* this same purpose. So the farmer only gets $700 for his tobacco; but this diminishing process has not stopped yet. This farmer exchanges his tobacco for the $700, because he wants to buy goods and groceries and agricultural implements, &c., &c., of the merchants, and they could not buy his tobacco, for they wanted money, and money he must have to get these articles of necessity from the merchant. So, of course, he was compelled to convert his tobacco into money, and from this operation of money, as just stated, he lost nearly a third of his tobacco; but the merchants, like the tobacconists, borrowed money of the banks for the purpose of buying merchandise and pay the fifteen per cent on the money borrowed, and in pricing his goods calls this fifteen per cent. for the money borrowed and fifteen per cent. on his own account prime cost, and makes this prime cost a part of the price of his goods. Hence, when the farmer buys goods of this merchant or merchants, he pays this prime cost in paying for the goods, as this prime cost constitutes a part of the price of the goods. So, this second operation of the cost of exchanging value or increase of money diminshes his $700 $210, or, in round numbers, $200; but this diminishing of the value of his tobacco is not yet complete. For this Richmond merchant buys his merchandise of some wholesale merchant in Baltimore or New York, or some other city; and this wholesale merchant does the identical thing that the Richmond merchant did—borrows money of the bank, but did not, I presume, pay so much increase as the Richmond city merchant—say he paid six per cent. So he adds on twelve per cent. as the prime cost of the merchandise he sells to the Richmond merchant, and which the Richmond merchant sells to the farmer, and which also constitutes a part of the price of the goods which the farmer buys, and which, therefore, diminishes the price of his tobacco a third time; but the wholesale merchant in New York buys the goods of a manufacturer, and the manufacturer buys the raw material of those who have it, wherewith to manufacture the goods which this farmer buys in the city of Richmond. Thus the farmer's tobacco is likewise diminished by the manufacturer and the furnisher of the raw material in the same manner as it was diminished by the two merchants and the tobacconist through the operations of interest on money; and, supposing this interest to be only six per cent in each case, the sum total of this diminution would amount to sixty per cent.—$600 of the $1,000 taken solely for the fictitious increase of the money used in exchanging this tobacco for the merchandise; but this does not include the whole history of this farmer's tobacco, for, in the beginning, another difficulty is encountered, since the tobacconist has it in his power to price the farmer's tobacco, and since manufacturers of tobacco, as a rule, become rich while the producers of tobacco get poorer and poorer every year, the inference is inevitable that the manufacturers, in purchasing tobacco, act upon the principle of giving the *least possible* in order to make the *most possible*. Hence, it is a matter of fact that it is absolutely impossible for a farmer to borrow money to the extent of one half of the value of his farm, and *ever become* able to return the money borrowed; if ever it is done, it is an exception to the rule. Therefore, in the county of Buckingham and the adjoining counties on both sides of the river all of the finest estates therein have passed out of the hands of those individuals who have borrowed money equal to one half of the value of said estates. We will take a single instance—for one will suffice—to demonstrate the injustice and wrong that this infernal principle, *increase of money*, inflicts upon this class. A certain farmer on James river borrowed, in 1845, $4,000 and gave a lien upon his estate to secure the payment of said money, rate of *increase*, six per cent., payable semi-annually. Up to this time said farmer has paid $12,000, including one half of his farm, and still owes $4,000; paid $12,000 for increase—paid this vast amount of money for the use of this money, as the money-lender phrases it, though the $4,000 passed entirely out of his hands about a month after it was borrowed and he has not had it in his possession since. It, as far as he was concerned or knew, might be in the banks in China, or in the banks in Europe, or it might be loaned to a hundred different people, and therefore robbing a hundred different people at the *same time*, up to the present moment; but one thing is *certain*, this $4,000 robbed said farmer for thirty-nine years after it had passed entirely out of his hands, and robbed him at the rate of $240 each year, and is *still robbing him at the same rate;* but this statement, infernal as it is, does not include the whole of the operations of this *honest kind* of money. Half of all of the productions of said farm, from 1845 up to the present time, a period of forty years, were absorbed while being exchanged, taken and converted into money—taken, too, in virtue of the monstrous assumption that the cost of the silver dollar grows, like a grain of wheat, but grows by the decrease of value; nor is this the whole of these monstrous results of this infernal principle—exacting increase of money. The finale is this, that the borrower of this prolific $4,000, through the agency of the monstrosity called law, must, of necessity, lose the other half of *his farm*—must be turned out of his house; for this same monstrosity, called law, that authorizes the constant robbery that culminates in the stealing of his entire farm, also authorizes the executioner of this most unmerciful and inhuman law to put this farmer and his family *into the public road;* and the exactor of increase and the lawyer, and the judge, and the sheriff, all participators in this most merciless and most remorseless transaction, regard it as eminently just and right and proper. In addition thereto, the pulpit and the press and the bar sanction and approve this exacting of increase, which inflicts such a flagrant and diabolical outrage upon every principle of common sense, and every dictate of justice and mercy and humanity. Yes, it is an appalling fact that the whole of Christendom, without a dissenting voice, have, in the entire past, and up to the present moment, approved and sanctioned this principle of exacting increase of money—a principle which received from the Maker of the Universe, the Judge of the whole earth, a Being infinitely *good*, *wise and just*, a greater degree of condemnation than was extended to any other or all other evil principles combined.

We propose now to show how this principle, exacting increase of money, combined with the *monopoly-power* of this so-called honest money affects the labor class—those who obtain the necessaries of life by or in the sweat of their face. And, to do this, we present a case that occurred in one of the cities of the State of Virginia, wherein tobacco on a large scale is manufactured. A manufacturer of tobacco in said city, it was reported, made in one year $50,000 *clear of all expenses*, and the writer of this address having heard this statement time and again—in fact, heard it three times within three hours in the streets of said city, upon enquiry ascertained that the statement was true, and that the facts involved therein were as follows: First, the manufacturer borrowed money, say $100,000 of a bank or banks in said city, wherewith to purchase the tobacco that was manufactured and to defray all of the other expenses involved in the manufacturing of tobacco, and these expenses, as far as ascertained, were as follows: First, one hundred laborers or thereabouts, were employed. Second, they worked about three hundred days, and their daily wages averaged about one dollar. Hence, the expense of the labor amounted to $30,000 in the year. The other items of expense, the cost of the tobacco in its raw state, the tax on the manufactured tobacco, the salary of the superintendent, $2,500, interest on the money borrowed, $6,000, and every other item of expense involved in the manufacturing of said tobacco, were all paid from the proceeds of the sale of said manufactured tobacco, and then this manufacturer had $50,000. Hence, as the manufacturer *owned the raw material* upon which these one hundred laborers worked three hundred days, the manufacturer, of necessity, came into the possession of the entire value imparted by these one hundred laborers in three hundred days, and, from this value, the value of the manufactured tobacco, when sold, he paid *all* of the expenses involved in the manufacturing of the raw material for the whole year, and then had as his share of this one year's transaction $50,000.

Now, these expenses were $106,000, and the net profits $50,000, but these one hundred laborers paid all the expenses and received none of the profits, while the manufacturer paid not a cent of the expenses, $106,000, but received all of the profits, $50,000. Then this important question arises: What do the laborers get in all instances of this character? And the answer, clear, complete and conclusive, is this—that they do not get the slightest compensation. For, in the first place, they return their wages, and they, therefore, constitute *only* a loan. In the above case, each man was loaned, during the year, $300, but, at the end of the year, each man returned the $300; in the second place they pay all of the expenses, and, in the third place, they receive not a cent of the profits. They, therefore, only feed, house and clothe themselves from their wages, and then return them at the end of the year. It is also made manifest by an analysis of this case, that while these laborers did not and could not *borrow* money, yet they were made, in profound ignorance of the fact, to return, out of the proceeds of their labor, not only the whole of the money borrowed by the manufacturer, $100,000, but paid the interest thereupon for one year, amounting to $6,000. Nor is this the whole of this monstrous transaction ; these laborers, in the sweat of their faces, made and gave $500 each to this manufacturer, being the net proceeds of their entire labor for the whole year, and without receiving any equivalent.

But all this, bad as it is, does not include the whole of this monstrous transaction. The wages of these laborers, amounting to $30,000, was, as a matter of necessity, spent in furnishing food, raiment and habitation, and *one-half at least of the cost* of these necessaries of life consisted of increase of money—said increase being a part of the price of these necessities of existence.

Again, these laborers had consented and bound themselves by law to exchange their labor for money, and had also agreed to allow the banks the exclusive monopoly of money, while the banks, on their part, would neither lend them money nor employ them, and those who had the necessaries of life would not exchange them *for labor*, but *only* for *money;* then they must either beg or steal or starve, or work for those individuals who had the *monopoly* of borrowing money, and borrowed money for the purpose of employing labor, and the borrowers of money have the privilege of pricing labor, while the owner of labor, if a man, is forced to take the price offered, or beg, steal, or starve, and, if a woman, beg, steal, starve or "go to the bad." Hence, from these statements of facts, concerning the owner of capital and the owner of labor, the relation of capital and labor may be easily ascertained. For, the owner of capital, in all instances similar to the above case, purchases the raw material, and, the entire labor of the one hundred men being placed on said raw material, increased its value to such an extent that, when converted into money, it gave the owner of the raw material $50,000 clear of all expenses. Hence, each individual of the one hundred laborers pays to the owner of capital $500 at the end of the year, said $500 being the net proceeds of his labor for the entire year. Again, the wages of the one hundred laborers for the year were $30,000, and, as each laborer received $300 in the way of wages, and they constituted a portion of the expenses, and said laborers paid the whole of the expenses, each laborer, therefore, at the end of the year, *returned his wages*, $300 each.

Then, in all cases of this character, it is plain that the owner of capital gets everything that labor produces, and, of course, the owner of labor does not get the slightest compensation for his labor—he is simply fed, housed and clothed from his own labor.

"But" says a defender of the capitalist,—and this is a say often repeated—"it is really an act of charity to employ the laborer so as to enable him to live, rather than perish for the want of the necessaries of life." Grant it to be so; but who or what dragged him into this position, so that he must either work for a bare subsistence or beg, or steal or starve. Evidently, it was accomplished by the monopoly of money, and the monopoly of money by a few people was evidently obtained by fraudulent means, since, prior to the invention of money, there were no money-changers. Hence, the producers of value, were *alone* the *creators* of money, and it was *created* to *exchange* the values which they *alone produced*. Of course, it was a downright, palpable, gross, infernal fraud for a few people to obtain a monopoly of this money, created by all of the producers of value combined, for the common benefit, and then by *this monopoly* of their own property, force them into this horrible position, to beg, steal or starve, or work for a bare subsistence, since the larger portion of the proceeds of their labor goes, as already demonstrated, into the pockets of the monopolists of money. Is then, this transaction just? Is it merciful? Will it stand the *test* of the Golden Rule—"Do as you would be done by?" I answer emphatically, No! It is an open, direct, flagrant violation—to the greatest extent conceivable—of every principle of mercy or justice, Divine or human!

But, it would be more than useless, it would be criminal to call the attention of the people of this country to the magnitude of the evils arising from the present mode of using money, unless a remedy was suggested whereby these evils could be avoided; and the fact that these evils come from the exacting of increase of money, and that this principle, with its monopoly adjunct, is derived from the intrinsic value of the substance made money, then, logically, it follows that the only possible remedy for the great evils which are produced by the use of gold and silver money is to place the purchasing power of money upon a substance that is destitute of intrinsic value, say a paper substance, and then paper money would be free of cost and would be common property, could be readily carried about one's person in large amounts, and easily transmitted from place to place, and have a sufficient degree of durability—in a few words, make "greenbacks" money. This being done, it is evident that this paper currency would produce results directly opposite to those that we have already clearly and undeniably shown are produced by the use of gold and silver money. Take the above assumed case for illustration: Greenbacks or paper money being the currency, we would have government banks in the place of the banks of individuals, and paper money in the place of gold and silver money. Then, the one hundred laborers, through a superintendent appointed by the State or Federal Government, would borrow the $100,000 to purchase the tobacco whereupon the labor of these one hundred men, for the year, would be placed, and at the end of the year the manufactured tobacco being sold, the superintendent would return the money borrowed to the government bank, and, having paid all expenses, would turn over the net *profits* to the one hundred *laborers*, amounting to $700 for each individual, since there would be an increase of the profits amounting to $20,000, owing to the absence of the growing principle of the silver dollar. Truly, a wonderful difference! But a difference *resulting solely* from the use of money according to the *Lord's idea*, and ceasing to use it according to the *Devil's idea;* one use giving to the laborer what he earns in the sweat of his face, while the other use constitutes the owner and monopolist of money a *drone* in the social hive; that is, he, as a drone, eats the larger portion of the honey which the workers make, and, therefore, leaves them in a state verging upon starvation.

We propose, therefore, such a change in the laws concerning the use of money as will *convert the drone into* a worker, so that *he, too,* shall comply with the *Divine injunction,* "thou shall eat thy bread in the sweat of thy face." We also propose an adoption of the other five civil laws given by the *Divine* Lawgiver, as a *substitute* for the five civil laws at present existing in the civil government of this country, as well as in the civil governments of all Christian nations. But this change has reference chiefly to the *principles* contained in these civil laws, and not to the persons selected to administer said civil laws, except so far as their *qualifications* to administer said civil laws are concerned. For while the peculiar *profession* of the lawyer would be dispensed with, he could be made a judge, and since his *aspirations* are in that direction, he would be promoted to a more honorable position, and, *certainly,* one more useful; and in this position he would be rid of the cruel necessity of listening to *long* and *tiresome* harangues on the opposite side of the same question, but which he could readily determine for himself, *without any assistance,* by the testimony given, and which he is compelled to hear. In addition to this his Honor would be rid of "the jury of twelve," who, as compared with his Honor, *are far less competent* to decide the questions at issue. And reason dictates that it is absolutely impossible to suggest a better mode of settling disputes between man and man than that suggested by the Divine Lawgiver, to-wit: settle all disputes between man and man by men to be called judges, according to the testimony; said judges to be *just, intelligent, discrete* men, *God-fearing* men, and men *hating covetousness.*

With reference to the present bank officers it would not, in the least degree, interfere with them. except on the ground of incompetency, since the bank officers, under the new system, would have the identical functions to perform as in the old system, saving and excepting the exacting of increase, and the leaving of that out would greatly diminish the amount of the labor to be performed, and the character of the work would be much less intricate, and, therefore, more readily performed, and, of course, they would be reappointed on the ground of having the requisite knowledge and experience in conducting the affairs of a bank; and their salaries would be paid by the government, and, doubtless, liberal salaries would be given, as their services faithfully performed would be of great use to the community. While referring to the mode of settling difficulties, including the trial of the thief and murderer, I omitted to state that no appeal from the decision of the judges was allowed, I also failed to state the sixth civil law, to-wit: the total prohibition of the *exacting of* security

Then, this is the general proposition—that the people of every State in these United States form themselves into and constitute one party, with one great end, to-wit: the adoption of and placing in the Constitution of these United States, *the aforesaid* six Divine civil laws, and the repeal of all the laws and statutes and enactments contrary to or that cannot be made to harmonize with said six Divine civil laws, and in this programme is included a *year of Jubilee*, in accordance with *the Divine requirement*, and this proposition, startling and extreme as it may seem, contemplates the bringing into existence the very state of *things*, shadowed forth by this Divine language, to be found in the fifth verse and twenty-first chapter of Revelations: "and He that sat upon the throne said, behold *I make all things new*; and He said unto me, write: for *these words are true* and faithful."

We propose now to demonstrate that the debt of the State of Virginia has been created by the exacting of increase, and since the exacting of increase is taking something without rendering an equivalent, therefore, the State debt is an unjust debt, and, that, in fact, according to the dictates of common sense and justice, the bondholders really *owe* the State of Virginia; since the State of Virginia has paid to the bondholders a *great deal more* than they were entitled to. We will illustrate this position by taking the canal debt as an example. The State, in 1835 or thereabouts, borrowed $7,000,000 to construct the James River and Kanawha Canal; terms six per cent. per annum, to be paid annually. Therefore, up to this time, the people of Virginia have paid for this $7,000,000 $21,000,000 for increase—paid the entire debt three times—and still the people of this State, according to the Devil's idea about the use of money, owe the whole of the original debt, $7,000,000; but, according to the Lord's idea concerning the use of money, this State has paid the bondholder $14,000.000 more than he was entitled to. Let us, then, analyze rigidly and minutely this curious transaction between the people of this State and the lenders of this prolific $7,000,000, otherwise it is impossible to understand fully and clearly this *remarkable transaction.* In the first place, we agreed to pay the bondholders annually $420 000; but the silver dollar has a double value, and the bondholder owning the silver dollar, owns both of these distinct values Then, in order to ascertain clearly the true nature of this transaction, it is necessary to ascertain with absolute certainty for which of these two distinct values of his $7,000,000 was the $420,000 annually paid, it being self-evident that only one of these two distinct values can be used at the same time. When this question is propounded to the bondholder, he answers in this vague way—"that he demands it for the use of his money"—that is, for its, purchasing power; but it can be shown that the bondholder is mistaken: for it is undeniable that his $7,000,000, in the bullion state, did cost, on the ground of their intrinsic or jewelry value, $7,000,000, and, therefore, cost *can* be and *is* predicated of them, while it is equally well known that cost can not possibly be predicated of the other value of the silver dollar, its purchasing power, for it was created by the combined consent of the owners and producers of value to do certain specific things, (already stated) and neither cost nor increase can be predicated of consent. It is also equally well known that the silver dollar, in virtue of its purchasing power, is loaned and borrowed, and that it buys and sells, is also a legal tender for all debts, public and private. It is, therefore, evident that cost can not be predicated of the uses or qualities which appertain to the purchasing power of money. It is also well known that a certain class have a monopoly of money while another class have the monopoly of borrowing, and the second-class can use his money precisely as the monopolist does, and, finally on this subject, it is known that the law allows the lenders of money to take the cost of his silver or gold dollars from the person or persons to whom he loans his money, but did not allow him to take it more than once, since to take the cost of the same thing twice or three times, or an indefinite number of times, is manifestly unjust: for what could possibly be more unjust than for a merchant to sell any individual a certain amount of goods for $100 and then insist upon said individual paying him $200, or $300, or $400 for said goods, and it is evident that a transaction of this character is contrary to all law and to all justice, and to all common sense, and to universal custom; and yet it is a remarkable fact that this is precisely what the money-changers are continually doing, though doubtless profoundly ignorant of it, since he thinks that the exacting of increase is the "sanctum sanctorum."

Hence, in the above case the bondholder was paid in the first sixteen and two-third years $7,000,000, being the *full cost once* for the $7,000,000 borrowed. In the second sixteen and two-third years he was paid another $7,000,000, being the full cost *twice* of the borrowed $7,000,000. In the third sixteen and two-third years he was paid cost the third time for his borrowed $7,000,000. In other words, he, the bondholder, was paid three distinct times for the cost of his $7,000,000, and yet the State of Virginia still owe him $7,000,000—paid him $21,000,000, and still owe him $7,000,000; but this statement does not exhibit the whole of this *extraordinary fraud.*

The first $7,000,000 paid by the State of Virginia at the end of the first sixteen and two-third years, the money-lender, as a matter of course, loaned to other parties whom, for brevity's sake, we call No. 1. Hence, at the end of the second sixteen and two-third years he had $14,000,000 to loan, one $7,000,000 from the State of Virginia, and one $7,000,000 from No 1, and he lends one $7,000,000 to No. 2 and one $7,000,000 to No. 3. Hence, at the end of third sixteen and two-third years he, the bondholder, has $28,000.000 to loan, which he gets respectively from the State of Virginia, from No. 1, from No 2 and from No. 3, and in addition to this, he has $28,000,000 due him, one $7,000,000 from No. 1, one from No. 2, one from No. 3, and one $7,000,000 from the State of Virginia, making $28,000,000 to loan and $28,000 000 due to him; but in this calculation, as is evident, I have failed to compound, and omitted it because of its tediousness; but since the money-lender, as a rule, compounds then, this principle being acted upon in this case, the State of Virginia, from the $7,000,000 borrowed for the purpose of constructing her canal, in fifty years funished the lender or lenders, with the means of realizing $112,000,000, and paying them directly from her own resources $21,000,000 of the $112,000,000, but still owes $7,000,000 to the holder of her bonds. Now, the above fraud consists in the palpable fact that the $420,000 paid annually, though allowed by law and sanctioned by custom, was paid without the parties paying it receiving the slightest compensation therefrom: for we have already shown that when the money-lender had his silver bullion converted into said $7,000,000, he *then* and *there* pledged and bound himself and had everybody else pledged and bound to use said $7,000,000 *only* for its exchanging value or purchasing power imparted to them at the Government mint; and the Constitution of these United States obligates and requires the Supreme Court of these United States to enforce rigidly a strict compliance with the above pledge on the part of the contracting parties. The owners and lenders of gold and silver money likewise pledge or bind themselves that said gold and silver dollars, in the exercise of their functions as money, shall give value for value; and it is also a fact, and an unquestioned fact, that the money-lender and everybody else uses the silver dollar only for its *purchasing power*. It is also an unquestioned fact that the intrinsic value of the silver dollar is in an undeveloped state, called a state of potency, and, therefore, in this state is utterly incapable of increase or growth. But, strange to say, some person or persons, unknown thousands of years in the past (and of course *dead*) had a law enacted (and *blindly* adopted by all succeeding ages) allowing the money-lender to exact increase for this worthless, undeveloped value of the silver dollar, a value too, which the money-lender can not *give*, and which the borrower neither *gets* nor *wants*; and the money-lenders exact the increase in such a mode as to make the silver dollar *grow like a grain of wheat*—adds to itself in four hundred years, at seven and a half per cent., compounding every twelve months, $1,099,511,627,774, but adds this vast amount to itself by decreasing value to this same vast extent without rendering the slightest equivalent to the owners of the values decreased. Now, this peculiar operation of the silver dollar furnishes a solution of this singular and curious transaction, to-wit: That the State of Virginia having paid her canal debt ($7,000,000) *three distinct times*, still owes *the original amount of the debt* ($7,000,000,) for which the State of Virginia paid $420,000 annually, this being one-sixteenth part of the $7,000,000, the bondholder assumes that this $420,000 is the *annual increase* of the INTRINSIC VALUE of the $7,000,000. But this assumption is *utterly false* as *well as stupid*, since the intrinsic or jewelry value of the $7,000,000 remained therein *indissolubly connected with its silver substances*, and in their worthless state, called a state of potency. Hence, the State of Virginia did not use the *intrinsic value* of the money borrowed, but borrowed the $7,000,000 only for its purchasing power, and used it as such; besides the bondholder had bound the State of Virginia by the fundamental law of these United States not to convert his silver dollars into jewelry, but to use them as money. In fact, it is self-evident that if the State of Virginia had been sufficiently satisfied to convert the $7,000,000 into jewelry, she could not have constructed *the canal with it*, and the owner or owners of these $7,000,000 of silver substances would have promptly and *scornfully* refused to receive them when offered in the form of various kinds of Jewelry. Hence, it is as clear as a sunbeam that the State of Virginia did not and could not use or get the intrinsic value of the $7,000,000, but did get and use its extrinsic value, called its purchasing power, a value given to it by the people of these United States, through their agent, the Federal Government. It, therefore, is self-evident that the assumption of the bondholder that the $420,000 annually paid by the State of Virginia was the annual increase or growth of the intrinsic value of his $7,000,000 is excessively *stupid*, *false* and *fraudulent*, and constitutes the greatest and wildest and *most destructive* and most astounding *phantasy* that ever entered the *perverted* mind of the *Father of all Lies*: for the Apostle Paul was authorized *by Divine authority* to assert that the love of money is the root of all evil, and the love of money is excited in the human mind by the *accumulative power of money*, and not by its purchasing power, and the Satanic *idea* concerning the *increase of money* alone produces its accumulative power.

Hence, it is clearly demonstrated, beyond the shadow of doubt or question, that, since the State of Virginia has, in fifty years, paid annually four hundred and twenty thousand dollars as interest on the seven millions borrowed in 1835 to construct the James River Canal, she has paid the bondholder fourteen millions more than he was entitled to. Since the twenty one millions was the interest on or increase of the seven millions, said increase of said seven millions being a palpable, self-evident fraud, because taken from the various values of the people of the State of Virginia solely from the assumption on the part of the bondholder that the undeveloped intrinsic value of his seven millions of dollars *increased* four hundred and twenty thousand annually for a period of fifty years—an assumption known and universally admitted to be utterly false, *because* it is *utterly impossible* for a *silver substance to grow*. Therefore, deducting the seven millions borrowed from the twenty-one millions paid him without an equivalent received, Mr. Bondholder will be justly due the State of Virginia fourteen millions of dollars; and that the owners and lenders of gold and silver money may have a clear conception of its mysterious but fraudulent operations, we will present, in figures, a brief statement of its operations, so that he may be somewhat reconciled to the proposed abandonment of the *growing feature* of the silver dollar, and for this purpose we will use one silver dollar at seven and a half per cent., compounding every twelve months, a rate which causes it to double every ten years; and we will call the original dollar No. 1, and its increase, as they come into existence, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, No. 6, &c., &c. Then, No. 1, in ten years, on the ground of the cost of its intrinsic or jewelry value, adds to itself dollar No. 2, and, since no one wants or gets the jewelry or intrinsic value of dollar No. 1, dollar No. 2 is taken by No. 1, *without giving any equivalent*, so that No. 1 steals No. 2. In the second ten, in the same way, No. 1 and No. 2 steals each one dollar, No. 3 and No. 4. In the third ten, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4 steal each one dollar, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7 and No. 8. In the fourth ten, No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7 and No. 8 steal each one dollar. No. 1 steals No. 9, No. 2 steals No. 10, No. 3 steals No. 11, No. 4 steals No. 12, No. 5 steals No. 13, No. 6 steals No. 14, No. 7 steals No. 15, and No. 8 steals No. 16; and, in four hundred years, as already demonstrated, this dollar No. 1 and its thievish offspring, would increase, in the above identical mode, to $1,099,511,627,774, and would take from the values exchanged this vast amount of value in the form of money, and take it without giving to the owners thereof any equivalent. Now, it is absolutely necessary for any human being to conceive of a system of stealing more perfect and more complete than the system indicated by the above figures, and it is a kind of stealing totally different from any and all kinds ever known or practised by any human thief: for this Devil's thief, the silver dollar, not only steals value to the amount of one dollar, but converts the value stolen into another thief like itself, so that the value stolen becomes like the thing that steals it—*a thief.* For instance, in the above example, No. 1, on the ground of the cost of its intrinsic value, takes value to the amount of one dollar, and as the money-lender collects all costs in money, at the end of the first ten, No. 1 adds to itself No. 2, so the value stolen becomes like the thing that steals it—a thief. In the second ten, thief No. 1 steals a second time, value to the amount of one dollar, and converts it into thief No. 3, and thief No. 2 steals value to the amount of one dollar and converts it into thief No. 4. In the third ten thief No. 1 steals value a *third* time to the amount of one dollar and converts it into thief No. 5; thief No. 2 steals value a second time and converts it into thief No. 6; thief No. 3 steals value and converts it into thief No. 7, and thief No. 4 steals value and converts it into thief No. 8. Now, this wholesale stealing, as indicated by the above figures, (and figures do not lie) is evidently accomplished by the owner and lender of the silver dollar using each of its distinct values at the same time, he uses one to exchange all kinds of value, and uses the other, its intrinsic value, to rob the values it exchanges—robs them by taking from the values exchanged the cost of the intrinsic value of the silver dollar, and taking said cost from the values exchanged over and over again, an indefinite number of times, and taking it in money so as to make the silver dollar increase in a geometrical ratio, assuming said cost to be taken at the rate above specified and compounding every twelve months.

Again, this stealing feature of the silver dollar makes it absolutely certain that the words "thieves and robbers" used by the Lord were applicable only to the money-changers in the temple, and not to those that sold doves and sold oxen therein: for it is recorded in John, chap. 2d., verses 14, 15 and 16, "That Jesus found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: and when He had made a scourge of small cords, He drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' *money*; and said unto them that sold doves, take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise."

Then, it is evident that those who sold sheep and oxen also made *His* house (since He said to Philip "he that hath seen *me* hath seen *the Father*") a house of merchandise. Again, in Matthew, 21st chap., 12, 13 and 14 verses, we find these words: "And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves, and said unto them, it is written that MY HOUSE shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves and robbers." Hence, it is self-evident that since the men that sold doves and sheep and oxen only made the temple a *house of merchandise*, therefore, the money-changers who had money, and, of course, to loan, *made the temple a den of thieves and robbers.*

It then being clearly and fully demonstrated that the exacting of increase is an abominable kind of stealing, of which *mankind have been profoundly ignorant* in the entire past, we propose, therefore, to abandon it, by making paper money the money of this country, and, to further this object, we propose the formation of a new party in this State of Virginia, to be called the People's Party, with the motto: The Lord and the people against the Devil and the money power. We also propose that this party be formed as soon as possible, and use all means consistent with Christian principles to elect a governor, upon the avowed principle that we do not owe and will not pay another dollar to the bondholder in all those cases wherein the debt is similar to the canal debt, because it has been clearly and undeniably demonstrated within the pages of this little book that the claims of the bondholders, with reference to the canal debt, are null and void, because they have been paid *fourteen millions* of dollars more than they were entitled to in the estimation of the Judge of the whole earth—the same principle to be applied to all debts, public and private; and we finally propose that the people of these United States also form a People's Party, and the great end of this party shall be to place in the Constitution of these United States the six Divine civil laws given by the Maker of the Universe to the Jewish nation while acting as their Judge, Lawgiver and King.

LEWIS WARRINGTON CABELL,
BUCKINGHAM COUNTY, VA.

Address at present, Lynchburg, Va.